<center>Remarks</center>

Claim 44 has been amended. Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 14-18, 22-45 are currently pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

<center>Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102</center>

Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 14-18, and 22-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over Boss et al. (U.S. 5,758,110). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 is patentable because neither Boss nor the AAPA, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests determining the position and size of a shared application by "monitoring and **intercepting** function calls made by the shared application **to** a Graphics Device Interface" (emphasis added). Rather, the sensor application 107 of Boss intercepts display driver calls made by the graphical device interface 102 to the display driver 104 (see column 4, lines 49-58). Figure 3 of Boss clearly shows the sensor application 107 intercepting display driver calls made by the graphical device interface (GDI) 102 to the display driver 104, and _not_ function calls made by the Windows application 101 to the GDI 102. Display driver calls made by the GDI 102 to the display driver 104 are different from function calls made by a shared application to a Graphics Device Interface. Therefore, Boss does not meet the scope of the claim limitation of determining the position and size of the shared application by **intercepting** function calls made by the shared application **to** the Graphics Interface Device, as specifically required by claim 1.

In the Examiner's response to the Applicants previous arguments, the Examiner appeared to argue that Boss meets the scope of claim 1 "by intercepting tasks (display driver calls) and if the task is part of the shared application it is transmitted and displayed to the client system (col. 2, lines 57-67)" (see page 6 of Office Action). However, claim 1 does not merely require monitoring the shared application by intercepting tasks (display driver calls). Rather, claim 1 _specifically_ requires intercepting function calls made by the shared application itself, which are different from display driver calls made by the graphical device interface (GDI) 102 of Boss. Further, the point of interception in claim 1 is completely different from Boss. Claim 1 intercepts function calls by the shared application to the Graphics Interface Device, while Boss

<center>15</center>

intercepts display driver calls by the GDI 102 to the display driver 104. Boss does not show any interception of function calls by the Windows application 101 to the GDI 102.

Applicants note that in order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must show <u>each and every element</u> of the claim <u>as arranged</u> in the claim (see M.P.E.P. § 2131). Furthermore, "[t]he <u>identical</u> invention must be shown in as <u>complete detail</u> as contained in the…claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Corp.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). None of these requirements for anticipation are meet here for at least the reasons given above.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 9, 17, 25, 31, 37, 38, and 40 are patentable for the same reasons given above for claim 1. Claims 2, 6-8, 10, 14-16, 18, 22-24, 26-30, 32-36, 39 and 41 are dependent claims, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 31, 37, 38, and 40.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 42-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boss et al. (U.S. 5,758,110) and in view of "official Notice". Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 42-43 depend from claim 1, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Claims 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boss et al. (U.S. 5,758,110) and in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 44 is patentable because neither Boss nor the AAPA, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests determining the position and size of an OpenGL region of a shared application by monitoring and <u>intercepting OpenGL function calls made by the shared application</u>. In contrast, Boss only teaches intercepting display driver calls made by the GDI 102 to the display driver 104. The AAPA does not disclose any method for determining the size and position of an OpenGL region of a shared application. Therefore, even assuming that one skilled in the art would want to modify Boss to determine the position and size of an

16

OpenGL region of a shared application, it would not have been obvious to do so by intercepting OpenGL function calls made by the shared application rather than intercepting display driver calls made by the GDI 102 as taught by Boss.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that the claim 44 is patentable over Boss and the AAPA, and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 44 be withdrawn.

Claim 45 is patentable because neither Boss nor the AAPA, taken either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests determining the position and size of the DirectDraw region by monitoring a DirectDraw COM interface. Boss teaches intercepting display driver calls made by the GDI 102 to the display driver 104. The AAPA does not disclose any method for determining the size and position of a DirectDraw region of a shared application. Therefore, even assuming that one skilled in the art would want to modify Boss to determine the position and size of a DirectDraw region of a shared application, it would not have been obvious to do so by monitoring a DirectDraw Com rather than intercepting display driver calls made by the GDI 102 as taught by Boss.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 45 is patentable over Boss and the AAPA, and requests that the rejection of claim 45 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Prompt and favorable action on the merits of the claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the undersigned can be reached at (949) 567-6700.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee which may be required in connection with this Amendment to deposit account No. 15-0665.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: October 5, 2005

By: _Eugn R Waly_____
Eugene R. Worley
Reg. No. 47,186

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2558
Tel. 949-567-6700
Fax: 949-567-6710

18